

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

PASCAL GEDEON Plaintiff, v. THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, et al., Defendants.	: : : : : : : : : :	Civil No. 2:22-cv-03595-JMG
---	--	-----------------------------

ORDER

AND NOW, this 14th day of March, 2025, upon consideration of Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 58), Plaintiff’s Motion to Appoint Counsel and Motion for Relief Under Rule 60(b) (ECF No. 63), Plaintiff’s Second Response to Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 65), and Defendants’ Reply Brief in Support of its Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 68), **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED AS FOLLOWS:**

1. Defendants’ Motion to Dismiss (ECF No. 58) is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff’s remaining claims are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.
2. Plaintiff’s Motions to Reconsider (ECF Nos. 63 & 65) are **DENIED**.¹

¹ Once again, Plaintiff seeks to challenge Judge Pratter’s ruling. This Court previously rejected a similar motion by Plaintiff. *See* ECF No. 61. “[A] district court may only grant relief under Rule 60(b)(6) in extraordinary circumstances where, without such relief, an *extreme* and *unexpected* hardship would occur.” *Satterfield v. Dist. Att’y Phila.*, 872 F.3d 152, 158 (3d Cir. 2017). “To the extent a moving party seeks to relitigate the court’s prior conclusions, Rule 60(b) is not an appropriate vehicle.” *Santiago v. Nash*, Civ. A. No. 05-4552, 2007 WL 2814647, at *4 (D.N.J. Sept. 24, 2007). The mere fact that Plaintiff disagrees with the Court’s prior ruling is not a proper basis for granting a motion for reconsideration. *See Martinez-McBean v. Gov’t of Virgin Islands*, 562 F.2d 908, 912 (3d Cir. 1977) (“Since legal error can usually be corrected on appeal, that factor without more does not justify the granting of relief under Rule 60(b)(6).”).

3. Plaintiff's Motion to Appoint Counsel (ECF No. 63) is **DENIED AS MOOT**.²
4. The Clerk of Court is **DIRECTED** to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:

/s/ John M. Gallagher
JOHN M. GALLAGHER
United States District Court Judge

² This Motion is moot now that Plaintiff's claims have been dismissed with prejudice; this case will be closed upon the entry of this Order.